

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

| | | |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------|
| KENNETH M. GREGORY, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff(s), |) | No. C09-1800 PJH (BZ) |
| v. |) | |
| |) | BRIEFING ORDER |
| CITY & COUNTY OF SAN |) | |
| FRANCISCO, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant(s). |) | |
| _____ |) | |


Plaintiff filed a motion to compel discovery on June 6, 2010. In response to the motion to compel, I ordered the parties to meet and confer, which they did on June 30, 2010. Defendant's counsel submitted an opposition to the motion on July 9, 2010, stating that she thought that all discovery issues had been resolved, but that if plaintiff needed more documents, defendant would consider the requests so long as defendants could do so "without undue burden." Opp. at 1. On July 16, 2010, plaintiff filed a reply to defendant's opposition to the motion to compel, claiming that he needs further discovery. In light of plaintiff's reply, it appears all discovery issues were not settled during the parties' meet

1 and confer session.

2 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that defendant file an opposition
3 to plaintiff's reply by **July 30, 2010**. Plaintiff shall file a
4 reply to that opposition by **August 9, 2010**. If the Court
5 feels a hearing is necessary it shall set one.

6 To the extent plaintiff seeks to reopen discovery, his
7 requests should be made with Judge Hamilton.

8 Dated: July 21, 2010

9 
10 Bernard Zimmerman
United States Magistrate Judge

11 G:\BZALL\REFS\GREGORY V. CITY & CTY S.F\DISC ORDER 2.wpd
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28